

**COMMUNITY HOMELESSNESS ADVISORY BOARD
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

MONDAY

9:00 A.M.

MARCH 2, 2020

PRESENT:

Neoma Jardon, Vice Chair
Marsha Berkbigler, Member
Kristopher Dahir, Member
Ed Lawson, Member

Nancy Parent, County Clerk
David Watts-Vial, Assistant District Attorney

ABSENT:

Bob Lucey, Chair
Oscar Delgado, Member

The Community Homelessness Advisory Board convened at 9:01 a.m. in the Washoe County Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

Vice Chair Jardon assumed the gavel in Chair Lucey's absence.

20-024C **AGENDA ITEM 3** Public Comment.

Mr. Jeff Church expressed disappointment because not all Board Members were present at the meeting, which he believed was potentially the most important of the year. He mentioned the Board's dissatisfaction with the 50 percent occupancy rate at the Sage Street subsidized housing project, adding the project was still not at capacity and had a current vacancy rate of 25 percent. He expressed concern about the coronavirus affecting homeless camps. He believed the issue could be discussed under Open Meeting Law because it was an emergency. He referred to Agenda Item 6 and said Board Members must be upset because tiny houses would be discussed instead of camping as agendized. He indicated he emailed a presentation to some Board Members. He referenced two prior requests by Member Berkbigler and Vice Chair Jardon about the locations of homeless camps and a discussion of safe camping locations, but neither was on this agenda. He hoped the Board would support the Built for Zero proposal. He submitted a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk.

Ms. Catherine MacIntosh said a large collection of people camping along I-80 near the County Administrative Complex received a notice recently, but it was vague so they were unsure whether it was a clean up or eviction notice. She asserted notices needed to make expectations clear, particularly when individuals were only given a couple

days to take action. She suggested allocating a parcel of land and providing toilets and a dumpster as a solution for the homeless living at that camp. She mentioned the homeless were often unable to make appointments because they found it difficult to sleep at night; they slept during the day when they could. She said exhaustion made it difficult for homeless individuals to get things done.

20-025C AGENDA ITEM 4 Approval of minutes of the February 3, 2020 meeting.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Berkbigler, seconded by Member Dahir, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Chair Lucey and Member Delgado absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 4 be approved.

20-026C AGENDA ITEM 5 Acknowledgement and approval of a correction to the Community Homelessness Advisory Board meeting minutes of January 6, 2020 to correct a clerical error with the minute item numbers. Nancy Parent, Washoe County Clerk

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Dahir, seconded by Member Berkbigler, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Chair Lucey and Member Delgado absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 5 be acknowledged and approved.

20-027C AGENDA ITEM 6 Update, discussion, and possible direction regarding the concept of an identified camping or sleeping location for individuals experiencing homelessness. Iris Jehle-Peppard, One Truckee River Partnership Coordinator.

Iris Jehle-Peppard, Partnership Coordinator for One Truckee River (OTR), introduced Eileen Bidwell who was the newly hired AmeriCorps member for OTR. She said Ms. Bidwell had 28 years of experience in the Seattle social services sector working with individuals experiencing homelessness.

In response to a prior public comment, Ms. Jehle-Peppard said there was some miscommunication regarding safe camps, which she thought would require a community effort. She said she had spoken with Chair Lucey about giving a presentation demonstrating what other cities were doing to address homelessness. However, feedback from non-profit organizations working with camps demonstrated enthusiasm for tiny homes, so OTR was responding to that interest.

Member Dahir observed the agenda item was not about tiny homes. He said he wanted to ensure the Board stayed on track with the agenda. Assistant District Attorney David Watts-Vial read Agenda Item 6's title and emphasized the phrase "...or sleeping

location...” For clarification, Member Dahir asked whether that could include tiny homes. Mr. Watts-Vial replied yes.

Ms. Jehle-Peppard said the topic of the presentation was the result of research and she thought other organizations would be more capable of discussing the logistics of implementation.

Nancy Parent, County Clerk, noted the speaker had handouts for the Board, copies of which were placed on the record. She said copies were also available for the public.

Member Berkbigler asked whether the implantation mentioned by Ms. Jehle-Peppard referred to tiny homes or a safe camping location. Ms. Jehle-Peppard replied it referred to either option. She noted OTR represented a diverse group of collaborating organizations and doing the research was a way for OTR to contribute to the issue. She said the presentation was only informational.

Vice Chair Jardon asked for clarification of which groups collaborated on the research. Ms. Jehle-Peppard said she would review why OTR was involved and Ms. Bidwell would discuss the four cities she researched and who she spoke with regarding those projects. Detailed research results were included in the handouts provided to the Board, but the presentation would only provide an overview of each project.

Vice Chair Jardon asked whether the materials provided to the Board were included in the agenda materials. Ms. Jehle-Peppard responded they were not because additional time was needed to compile the information. Vice Chair Jardon stated receiving the documentation during the meeting made it difficult for Board Members to prepare properly as they were unable to read and listen at the same time. She said the Board might need to see the presentation again when Chair Lucey was present and with the materials posted online with the agenda for the benefit of the community. She indicated the likelihood the Board acting on the item during this meeting was low.

Member Berkbigler stated the difference between a tent community and a tiny home community was significant. She had discussions with individuals who had experience with the Seattle tenting community and the outcomes they reported were not good. She thought the issue required significant discussion. She noted many projects in the community were in progress, such as the relocation of women and children in the shelters. She agreed with Chair Jardon about rescheduling the presentation with Chair Lucey present when it might be discussed more thoroughly.

Vice Chair Jardon stated OTR accomplished many things and she wanted to hear the presentation with the understanding that future presentations and discussions would need to take place. She asked whether Board Members wanted the presentation.

Member Berkbigler expressed great appreciation for OTR and asserted their importance was not in question. She had no objection to listening to the presentation with the understanding that no decision would be made on the issue at this meeting.

Member Lawson said it was unfair to expect a decision when Members were given 20 pages to read during the meeting. He thought the issue needed to be postponed until the next meeting. He said he could read the information and an overview presentation was not required.

Ms. Bidwell said she had not intended the item to be an action item. It was a huge undertaking and she thought multiple meetings would be required. Since the Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) was an advisory board, she thought the issue would go to the three jurisdictions before implementation could begin.

Vice Chair Jardon indicated the issue would go to the three jurisdictions, but the CHAB could take action on whether to send it to those boards. She said she was in favor of listening to the presentation.

Member Dahir expressed appreciation for the work OTR did and their intent. He said he had no objections to hearing the presentation.

Vice Chair Jardon asked Ms. Jehle-Peppard and Ms. Bidwell to proceed. Ms. Jehle-Peppard apologized for the confusion.

Ms. Bidwell clarified some of the information distributed to the Board was about tent cities in Seattle. She said information on tent cities was difficult to find. Many tent cities were managed by non-profit organizations consisting of homeless and formerly homeless individuals, and obtaining information from them was difficult. She noted she was able to speak with staff from the four cities mentioned in her presentation. She said tiny home villages had transitioned from tent cities, which were not effective.

Ms. Jehle-Peppard conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She reviewed slides with the following titles: One Truckee River; Images of participants; River Restroom Project; One Truckee River's Action Item 2.6.a; Share/Wheel's Tent Cities in Seattle, WA; Project: Tiny Homes Village; Project: Quixote Village; Project: Opportunity Village; Project: Dignity Village; Quote from Seattle Mayor Jenny Durkan; Proposed Next Steps; Affordable Housing Trust Funds; and contact information.

Ms. Jehle-Peppard said OTR was a collaboration of private and public partners focused on the implementation of the OTR Management Plan adopted by the three jurisdictions in 2016. The plan included more than 100 action items devoted to protecting the Truckee River. She noted the health of the river was connected to the region's homelessness issue. She said two action items were prioritized in 2017 by the OTR Partnership Council. First, the River Restroom Project would launch a pilot program by installing a Portland Loo at Broadhead Park during the upcoming summer. The second

action item concerned the continuum of housing. She reiterated the presentation was only informational and OTR would not recommend any action for the CHAB to vote on. She noted OTR staff intended to stay involved but other groups were more suited to leading the project. She would focus on promoting the River Restroom Project and Ms. Bidwell would promote the Truckee River Month in May.

Ms. Bidwell said she provided data on encampments in Seattle. She stated Seattle was the first city to provide public lands and funds for permanent encampments. She provided information about tiny villages because she found many encampments transitioned to tiny home villages, which were classified as enhanced shelters by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. She said the non-profit agency Share/Wheel managed tent cities established in Seattle during the 1990's and the Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI) served as fiscal agent. She reported a Seattle City ordinance allowed camps to remain in the same location for two years. Eight camps with approximately 100 residents each remained on church property. First Presbyterian Shelter also provided 175 safe spaces, supportive shelter with storage, 24-hour case management, supportive services, and health care access. She said there were no fees or time limits at the camps or the shelter. The camps had 24-hour security and police data showed no significant increase in crime. All the tent cities were self-managed and self-governed. The camps successfully served people who previously lived on greenbelts, streets, cars, and in hazardous situations. She stated the city of Eugene, Oregon passed a rest stop ordinance allowing an overnight sleeping program and legal parking for RVs in designated areas on public and private land. Sanctioned camps were sponsored by churches throughout the city.

She mentioned the statistics provided for the Tiny Homes Village in Seattle were incorrect. The 11,199 individuals classified as the unsheltered population included people living in shelters and motels. She said the number of unsheltered individuals in Seattle as of the Point-in-Time Count in 2019 was 5,228 individuals, but she believed that number had increased. The tiny home villages were located in 8 neighborhoods throughout Seattle on land owned by the city, utility companies, or private owners. She said there were 270 tiny homes serving approximately 300 individuals; four villages allowed couples and families while the other four allowed only singles. She stated LIHI contracted with the Human Services Department to manage the villages, secure funding and permits, coordinate construction, and recruit volunteers. Agency staff emphasized the need for liability insurance and legal representation. She stated the camps had a code of conduct and residents signed waivers agreeing not to sue the city or LIHI. She said the mission of the tiny home villages was to offer interim, temporary solutions for homeless individuals and provide access to case management and supportive services. She noted evidence and experience showed more people found permanent housing through this model. She mentioned the Seattle City Council voted to authorize 40 more tiny home villages throughout the city during their February meeting.

She spoke about Quixote Village in Eugene, Oregon, which was another tent encampment that transitioned into a tiny home village. Quixote Village was located in an industrial area owned by the county and leased to the non-profit organization Panza on a 41-year lease at \$1 per year. The village had over 30 tiny homes and served single adults.

Quixote Village grew to include two additional villages for veterans. She stated the village offered case management, peer mentorship, and alcohol and drug recovery support. She said a lawsuit filed against the city by downtown businesses led to the development of Quixote Village, but no other legal or environmental issues had resulted. She noted the village was drug and alcohol-free. Residents signed leases with Panza and paid 30 percent of their income per month. The mission of Quixote Village was to help those in need gain new footing in their lives through communal tiny home living. She said the program manager reported 90 percent of residents over the past two years moved on to permanent housing.

She said Opportunity Village in Eugene, Oregon was established after a legal tent city eviction in 2011 was followed by a city resolution in 2012 to find a site for homeless individuals to live. The village had 30 tiny homes and served singles and couples. Opportunity Village was owned and managed by the non-profit company Square One. The City of Eugene leased the land to Square One for \$1 per year and reported no issues with the tiny home village. She mentioned Opportunity Village employed only one part-time project coordinator. She said funds for the village were raised through grassroots efforts and community volunteers. She noted the Director of Square One indicated there had been legal issues with the sanctioned camps but not with the village. She stated two additional tiny home villages were built including a veterans' village in Clackamas County.

She discussed Dignity Village in Portland, Oregon, which was located on two acres of city-owned land. Dignity Village transitioned from a legal campground to the first tiny home village in 2000. She said seven additional tiny home villages in Portland were based on the Dignity Village model. The village had 45 tiny homes and housed 50 to 70 single adults. Dignity Village also had a day center that served many more individuals. She stated Dignity Village was a non-profit organization that funded the village through donations, grants, and collectively run small businesses. They had an annually elected membership council and employed one full-time project specialist funded by their county. There was no time limit for residents and each paid \$50 per month for liability insurance. She noted there had been no liability claims or legal issues during the village's 20-year history. The mission of Dignity Village was to create an autonomous, self-governed, self-managed, low-barrier, democratic community based on advocacy, grassroots organizing, community partnerships, and sustainability.

She summarized all tiny villages shared several key characteristics: they all began as permanent tent camps; they were located on donated land or land leased for \$1 per year; many were located in industrial areas; they were all self-governed and self-managed with staff support; and they all provided transitional housing. She stated tiny home villages were not a permanent solution to the homelessness issue.

Ms. Jehle-Peppard mentioned there was a local tiny home project called Hope Springs led by Northern Nevada HOPES. She expressed interest in learning about the project and how OTR might offer support. She said the Reno Initiative for Shelter and Equality (RISE) performed extensive research on operating a safe campground. Funding the expansion of the continuum of housing was an issue that needed to be addressed. She

believed everyone involved with solving the homelessness issue wanted the destination for the homeless living along to river to be somewhere other than a campground or tiny home village. She stated funding would be required to provide staff oversight of any new effort. She noted funding responsibilities for each jurisdiction were discussed extensively but she wondered whether any of the three jurisdictions had enough resources to meet the need presented in 2020. She mentioned the recently created affordable housing trust fund, which needed to be funded continually. She acknowledged transitional housing projects could be expensive. She referred to a 2006 article in the New Yorker titled "Million-Dollar Murray", which highlighted how expensive homelessness was when resources were not committed to addressing issue in the region.

Vice Chair Jardon thanked Ms. Jehle-Peppard and Ms. Bidwell for the presentation.

Member Berkbigler thanked them for the information and said she believed tiny homes were a more dignified way to resolve the homelessness issue. She said the Board would review the information and discuss the issue with Chair Lucey to examine the possibilities and discuss whether something could be done to hasten progress. She noted she previously asked for this type of information about possible solutions for the homeless.

Member Berkbigler asked whether the tent camps and tiny homes discussed had resolved the homelessness in their communities or whether there were still people camping by rivers and lakes. Ms. Bidwell replied there were people camping in the four cities where the tiny homes villages were located. She said the homelessness statistics in Seattle depressed her and she questioned what she accomplished during the 28 years she worked with the homeless. The issue had worsened although poverty levels remained stable, due mainly to the rapid increase in the cost of housing from relatively affordable to completely out of reach for many people.

Vice Chair Jardon mentioned she toured the Seattle tiny home village model in response to the needs developing in the local community. She went to Seattle with skepticism and many questions but returned with a positive view of the project. She was not discouraged because the villages had not fully solved the homelessness issues in those communities. She asserted the individuals living in those tiny homes were helped immensely. She said homelessness was a huge issue across many cities with increasing population and limited housing. She mentioned the City of Reno acquired information about the tent city in Modesto, California. She stated the city was no longer in place for two reasons: it was never intended to be a permanent encampment and the cost for eight months was approximately \$1.5 million. She believed the issue was the cost of continued operations more so than getting the land and the money to develop the project.

Ms. Bidwell said most tent camps in Seattle and Eugene were on church property, so churches shared responsibility with non-profit organizations. She believed the cities were not closely involved in the projects. She said in Seattle LIHI was the fiscal agent, but it focused on tiny home villages. She reiterated the Seattle City Council approved 40 more villages because they were very successful. She believed the issue was that tiny

home villages had not satisfied all of the need, to which Vice Chair Jardon responded they certainly filled a need.

Member Dahir said the intent of the conversation was to find an immediate solution for the people camping next to the river. He pointed out tiny home villages took time, money, and planning. He noted significant developments were underway, such as Our Place, which he hoped would produce some solutions. He stated the camps along the river were a weighty concern. He requested the intent of agenda items be made clear in the future. He noted Ms. Jehle-Peppard and Ms. Bidwell possibly had a different understanding of the agenda item, which was fine, but it was not what the Board expected to discuss. He clarified the Board wanted to hear immediate solutions to protect the river because it was a valuable resource. It wanted to discuss the option of a temporary camp because it might provide an immediate solution as a safe place for individuals to go at night instead of the riverfront. He asked that any future discussion on this item be focused on the river.

Ms. Bidwell reiterated finding up-to-date information on sanctioned camps was difficult.

Vice Chair Jardon said she thought the agenda item would be a staff presentation. She expressed appreciation for Ms. Bidwell's efforts on researching the topic and providing input. She mentioned the City of Reno spent significant time figuring out zoning and administering requirements for such a project. The first tiny home village in Seattle opened 90 days after the mayor made a statement implementing the project. She believed tiny home villages could be implemented in a short amount of time. She stated the determining factors were land, operations, and wraparound services to provide support.

Ms. Bidwell said the information provided showed the tiny home villages in all four cities had different models but were all built with the help of professional volunteers and involvement from the entire community.

Member Berkbigher thought staff was available to discuss the issue if the Board wanted additional information on possible next steps.

Assistant County Manager Kate Thomas acknowledged OTR's presentation would usually be presented by staff. She noted a variety of opinions became apparent when staff from the three jurisdictions began discussing how research would be organized. She said OTR staff offered to undertake some of the research because they were reviewing similar projects and the three jurisdictions accepted the offer to let OTR staff begin the community conversation. She expressed appreciation for the information provided by OTR. She assured the CHAB that staff from the three jurisdictions would continue to research the issue. She noted County staff was committed to completing the \$20 million Our Place project which had some upcoming deadlines. She knew City of Reno staff was involved in determining what the operator structure would entail for the downtown facility. She mentioned Agenda Item 8 would provide some guidance and oversight. She thought the Built for Zero collaborative would define the next steps in the process for the region.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Jeff Church provided a document, which was distributed to the Board and placed on the record for the meeting. He noted the agenda item was supposed to be a discussion of camping or sleeping locations, not tiny homes. He stated he contacted Ms. Thomas and other staff on multiple occasions about whether there would be research and a staff presentation on the agenda item. He believed mental illness and addiction were the primary concerns, not housing. He pointed out a number of sex offenders registered a local park as their primary residence; one even registered at a park that was within sight of an elementary school. He reviewed the safe camping resource area handout which he submitted to the Board.

Ms. Kim Barghouti, representing RISE, noted there were some aspects of camping that needed to be considered. She stated all tiny home communities began as safe camps. She noted camps were not a perfect solution nor intended to be permanent, but they were an improvement on existing conditions. She stated people needed to be moved from the riverfront and a safe camp would provide the grounds for them to relocate. She mentioned 200 people in a large encampment near the Record Street campus were given a verbal warning to move but they were not given a date or told where to go. Making that many people move would only result in many smaller camps around the area that would be asked to move again. She stated the homeless individuals in the large encampment were not hurting anyone or any businesses. She thought it was a waste of time and resources to make them move, and she believed a dumpster and portable restroom facilities should be supplied to clean up the location instead. She reported that RISE was working on a proposal and a budget for a safe camp.

Ms. Catherine MacIntosh read a quote about the perception that homeless people should forfeit their right to occupy public spaces like parks, libraries, and subway stations. She believed the people by the river should be allowed to enjoy the river, although a safe camp would be a better option. She acknowledged tent cities were not clean or pristine, but she believed an extreme solution was needed because homelessness was an extreme issue. She felt the community would come together to support a safe camp if given the opportunity.

Ms. Lisa Lee, Program Director for Foundation for Recovery, thanked Ms. Jehle-Peppard and Ms. Bidwell for the presentation. She mentioned she spent years experiencing homelessness in Seattle and had been to many of the locations discussed in the presentation. She said harm reduction and housing were the tools that helped her rebuild her life. Harm reduction was a social justice movement built on standing in solidarity with the most vulnerable in the community, and it addressed the social relationships and having purpose in life. When people were given the opportunity to be involved in their own organization, she said, it gave them a sense of purpose, taught them cooperation, and provided a sense of value because they focused on a mission. She hoped the Board would hear more about self-governing communities and wished to be invited to present the proposal RISE was developing.

Mr. Bruce Parks stated he had firsthand knowledge of what cities to the north were doing and strongly advised against following their example. He said their

systems failed and did not help their homeless situations. He believed taxpayers were paying for tiny home projects that created a dependent class of people trapped in a system of subsidized housing with no plan to become fully independent productive members of society. He said the place for people to get free housing, food, and health care was prison, and being trapped in a system was a type of prison. He saw each homeless person as a potential asset to the community and he hoped the cities to the north would enforce the laws, which he felt would resolve the homelessness issue.

Ms. Amanda Carter said she observed both safe camps and tiny home villages in Olympia, Washington, and she thought tiny homes were a more dignified solution. She stated tiny home villages would not affect permanent change unless sobriety was mandated. She agreed empowering the homeless to be part of their solution, giving them the necessary tools, and enforcing laws would all result in permanent change. Regarding the homeless in the encampment near Record Street, she noted many of those individuals had accessed resources as a result of being asked to leave. She said the forced change helped them make better choices. She indicated the consistent contact prompted them to willingly access resources that were already available.

20-028C **AGENDA ITEM 7** Update, discussion, and possible direction regarding an update on the Community Triage Center. Amy Roukie, Director, Community Triage Center at The Well Care Group.

Well Care's Community Triage Center (CTC) Director Amy Roukie, along with Managing Director Max Casal, presented an update on the reopening of the Record Street Community Triage Center on August 6. Ms. Roukie reviewed statistics collected during the reporting period which ended January 2020. She noted there had been a ramping-up period of ten days during which they had only accepted civil protective custody patients and Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority (REMSA) drop-offs, but since then the CTC was operating at full capacity. They served 907 individuals, 37 percent of which were uninsured. She said the CTC's low recidivism rate of 25 percent was in part due to the services the CTC provided.

Ms. Roukie reviewed information regarding the reported areas of residence of the individuals being served by the CTC. She noted approximately 2 percent of clients served since the reopening were from out of state, with most clients being from Reno, Sparks, or other areas in Nevada.

Chair Jardon said she often heard many individuals came from out of the area and wondered how Well Care had come up with the pie chart showing most clients reporting local zip codes. Ms. Roukie indicated over 90 percent of clients reported coming from local areas such as Reno or Sparks. Mr. Casal added that most homeless individuals gave the address of the shelter on Record Street or the CTC's local zip code. If the client was from out of the area and reported as such, that information would be captured, but many individuals provided the last addresses they lived at, even if they had not lived there for a while. He explained staff tried to gather accurate, current information whenever possible, but many clients came in highly intoxicated, which often made doing so difficult.

Ms. Roukie discussed the goal of diverting patients from the jail or the emergency room through civil protective custody. She spoke about medical exclusion criteria and who could be accepted, noting REMSA leadership was supportive of bringing individuals to the CTC regardless of whether or not insurance paid for their transport. She indicated the end goal was to increase patient education and self-referrals so they would later go directly to the CTC when in need rather than allowing things to escalate to a point where they ended up dealing with law enforcement or emergency medical services.

Ms. Roukie reviewed the demographics of the clients served. She said the CTC was a dorm-style setting with four dormitories, two for males with 12 beds in each, one dorm for females, and another for either males or females depending on the center's needs. She stated clients were usually between ages 31 and 69 and racial makeup was similar to that of Washoe County and the region in general. She noted any clients who left the CTC and needed life-sustaining medications such as insulin, hypertension medication, suboxone, or psychotropics were set up with an appointment with a care provider in the community. They would receive enough medication to last until the next appointment if there would be a gap of more than seven days.

Ms. Roukie explained another goal was to convert uninsured clients to insured; if a client consented, staff would assist with applications for welfare and Medicaid. She said this had been very successful, with 133 previously uninsured clients now able to access care through insurance services. She noted the CTC offered seven days of crisis housing to all clients upon discharge, regardless of their ability to pay. There were approximately 300 beds throughout the community with case management follow-up. Those with access to Medicaid had more options upon discharge.

With regard to civil protective custody, Ms. Roukie said she was often asked how many stayed after sobering up. By statute, she explained, individuals had to be offered treatment before jail. She noted law enforcement brought as many clients to the CTC as possible, though they did not bring individuals who were too aggressive or medically compromised. She said 139 civil protective custody clients had been admitted since opening, and the CTC refused very few of them. Once becoming sober, she stated, many clients were motivated to stay out of jail, and 66 percent chose to stay and go through detox in order to connect to services on some level.

Ms. Roukie explained the CTC was proud of their numbers and these clients were treated no differently than other clients not in civil protective custody. She said they also received the occasional college student or businessperson, worked to sober them up, and helped them understand they could come back to the CTC when they were ready to receive care. She stated their services had been previously unknown to many of these clients, who learned they could return for care in the future after they left.

Ms. Roukie described the vital sign checks done for each client every two hours for the first 24 hours. She said medical detox was then started based on those signs and symptoms. She explained it was unsafe for individuals to detox from alcohol or opiates on the street, and unfortunately there was no detox procedure for methamphetamines or

amphetamines. She noted 3,4-methylenedioxy-methamphetamine (MDMA) was also often found in the systems of many clients who used methamphetamines or amphetamines, and there was no detox for MDMA either. In these cases, staff could only medicate the clients' symptoms with Albuterol, Xyprexa, or antipsychotics. She noted some individuals chose to leave against medical advice, and around 24 percent of civil protective custody clients were resistant to treatment.

For aftercare, Ms. Roukie said the goal was to make sure clients who left continued with treatment at programs such as Bristlecone, New Frontiers, Vitality, Crossroads, or crisis stabilization housing. Regardless of the way they were discharged, clients were given access to intensive case management to bridge the time while they were at risk. The CTC often worked to ensure clients were at the top of the waiting list when discharged. She provided the example that Bristlecone had a 30-day waiting list, and staff worked with clients during that waiting period at no cost to the individual. For those who were insured, insurance often handled connecting clients to services. Ensuring that discharged individuals had access to food, transportation, bedding, case management, and other necessary support was vital to their success upon discharge.

Member Dahir expressed appreciation for the presentation and thought the CTC had done what they said they would do. He felt it was good that staff was working to get clients insured and help them move out of homelessness. He asked whether Well Care was still working to increase services which would help individuals become more independent. Ms. Roukie said Well Care staff helped individuals escape the cycle of homelessness and poverty by intervening with significant outpatient services and setting goals to assist non-disabled individuals to become independent and employed by the time they finished the program. They did this by providing chemical dependency treatment, intensive outpatient and group therapy, mental health care, housing, transportation, and work programs such as Well Care's 30-day foundational training, which linked clients to jobs and prepared them for interviews. She noted that program was currently 100 percent paid for by Well Care. She said it was very rewarding to watch clients finally receive their first paychecks, move to independent living, and achieve stability.

Member Dahir noted some individuals did not want to go to the Record Street location and asked about opening another campus in a different area. Mr. Casal indicated Well Care hoped to identify gaps in care in the community and work to bridge those gaps. He noted CTC's aftercare program offered services that continued beyond what clients received at the CTC, and fewer clients returned to the CTC or the emergency room or jail after discharge because of this. He expressed pride in the reduced recidivism and appreciation for Ms. Roukie and her team. He also felt collaboration with Volunteers of America was an exciting development which would have a large impact on the Record Street population. The CTC had tried to assist with the problems on Record Street as much as possible; all available beds were being used. He thought it might be time to start discussing future funding as they were now six months into a one-year agreement and decisions needed to be made whether to continue funding or to expand past the first 12 months. He noted funding only covered about half the cost of operating the CTC and it was imperative to be efficient.

Chair Jardon asked how many of the CTC's 300 beds were occupied. Mr. Casal advised a little more than 100 beds were currently occupied with patients from the behavioral health population and they worked with Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services to transition from the campus into CTC housing. He estimated there were about 60 severely mentally ill patients being helped. Chair Jardon asked whether the CTC had enough staffing to handle this if it were at full capacity, and Mr. Casal said he thought they did. He noted the CTC's housing rules were different than the housing-first model; they believed housing was a right and not a privilege, sober-living requirements needed to be met. He thought it might not work for those who were looking to take advantage or abuse the system, due to the rules and requirements.

Chair Jardon thanked Well Care for the presentation and said a system of communication and trust had been built. She said having CTC representatives who shared information at Community Homelessness Advisory Board meetings about their scope of services could reach well beyond the Record Street shelter and potentially impact the lives of many in need. She said accountability was beneficial, especially with the structure of the Reno Works program, and she believed individuals thrived when held accountable, although it might seem scary to them at first. She expressed appreciation for the work being done and hoped it would continue.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Jay Kolbet-Clausell discussed emergency response and noted there was currently a large encampment of around 200 individuals near the shelter. He called for more training and promoted a de-escalation training at the Sparks Library on March 17. He said over 100 people expressed interest in the training, which could help civilian employees understand how to respond to individuals in emotional crisis. He opined there was not enough emergency response available for those who needed wraparound programs. He spoke about some of the reasons group home placements sometimes failed. He mentioned the request for proposal (RFP) for the Community Assistance Center used old software which was not compatible with Americans with Disabilities Act software or other vision assistance programs, and he explained he was not able to open the RFP at home. This would limit the number of applicants as he and others with disabilities would be excluded from the pool.

There was no action taken on this item.

20-029C AGENDA ITEM 8 Update, discussion, and possible direction on the status of engagement with the Built for Zero Collaborative. Mike Kazmierski, President/CEO Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN).

Mr. Mike Kazmierski, President of the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada, said he had heard a lot of talk about homeless encampments. He said the goal was to solve the homelessness problem even though it would not happen right away. He felt the Built for Zero initiative had some good ideas and would help the community get onto the same path as other regions that had achieved success. He said he would like to be included on the list of successful regions. He stated County Manager Eric

Brown was in Washington D.C. at the National Association of Counties' conference and an implementation team was being identified to attend the April 2020 Built For Zero learning session in Arlington, Virginia. Mr. Kazmierski said the business community was there to help and be part of the solution.

Management Analyst Dana Searcy stated she had been identified as the lead for the Built for Zero team and would have more details in the next few weeks. She said there was a process underway with the Cities of Reno and Sparks to identify individuals who would be appropriate for the 8-person team attending the learning session. She advised they would soon be introduced to their coach who would have more information on the processes, topics, and resources available for the upcoming conference. She noted the team would provide Built for Zero with community data, such as the OrgCode, Inc. report, and conduct a community survey. She said Manager Brown would have thanked the City Managers for helping expedite the process if he were present. She looked forward to the team examining homelessness in the community on a comprehensive level.

Member Lawson expressed pride that staff had been able to bring the effort together from concept to implementation in less than two months, and he thanked the County and City Managers for stepping up. He noted the County Health Department had come up with the funding to pay for the program and thanked Washoe County for that. He felt the method of tracking every individual on their path from homelessness to recovery would help create well-rounded citizens.

Chair Jardon went over the cost and dates of the training. Ms. Searcy advised the training would be held April 14 through April 16, 2020. Chair Jardon clarified that, prior to the training, the group would have access to all the data gathered by OrgCode so they would be well prepared. She asked whether the team would make recommendations to the Board after the training or if Ms. Searcy thought they would have enough information to evaluate whether or not the community would benefit from camps or tiny houses.

Ms. Searcy thought they would and the goal was to look at the community as a whole to see how all efforts would fit together. She hoped the team would return in May with more details regarding the length of the process, the steps they would take, and a more detailed timeline.

Member Dahir cheered the team on. He admitted this was a difficult issue and it was important to collaborate and work together with everyone even though there were many different views, opinions, and passions. He asked everyone to stay involved.

Ms. Searcy clarified the survey which would be sent out was not a survey for the community as a whole, but would be sent to the three jurisdictions and key service providers in the community to gather important information and get the Built For Zero coaches up to date on what was happening in the local community. She thought much of the information might already be available in the recent OrgCode report.

Member Dahir stated he wanted to make sure expectations were clear for the team members attending the training in April. Chair Jardon discussed the timing of the Built For Zero learning session and the upcoming transition of women and families to the Our Place campus to free up space at the Record Street campus. She said the OrgCode report was a treasure trove of collaborative information that everyone would be able to utilize. She expressed appreciation to the County for the funding they provided and to the County and City Managers for their collaboration.

There was no public comment or action taken on this item.

20-030C **AGENDA ITEM 9** Board members announcements, reports and updates to include requests for future board agenda items.

Member Dahir requested to hear as much as possible about the progress of the Our Place campus. He was aware staff was hard at work on the project and he wished to celebrate their progress with them. He wanted Eddy House to make a presentation to the Board. He said great things happened at Eddy House and it would be good for the community to hear about achievements which occurred fairly quickly. He was interested in continuing the conversation about camping. He strongly believed the river was precious.

Member Berkbigler thought a presentation from The Reno Initiative for Shelter and Equality (RISE) about their efforts would be beneficial. She observed there appeared to be positive progress taking place and wondered whether RISE might become more involved. She asked why the tent camp was disbanded if staff was in search of a location for a tent camp. She understood it was for cleanliness. She asked why the organizations helping the homeless could not supply some facilities such as porta-potties and dumpsters for the existing tent camp. She thought providing facilities could assist the City of Reno with the cleanliness issue and serve as a short-term solution while other projects were developed. She wondered whether RISE might assist with that issue.

Vice Chair Jardon agreed with Member Berkbigler. Although nobody wanted to see individuals living next to train tracks, she wondered whether there were some opportunities at the existing encampment. She suggested cleanliness might be addressed but data could also be collected. She mentioned asking the individuals at the encampment what brought them to that point, what barriers they faced, and what resources they needed to get out of that situation. She noted the Reno City Council voted to sell property on Washington Street, currently the site of the overflow shelter, for an affordable housing project. A condition of the sale was that an alternate location had to be made available for the individuals at the overflow shelter. She said the timing of the sale would coincide with the opening of other projects. She understood that a vote had taken place for a large tent structure on the Mill Street site. She thought the Board needed updates on the potential of getting the Sheriff's Office tent and on the parcel on Mill Street.

20-031C **AGENDA ITEM 10** Items for possible consideration on the April 6, 2020 agenda:

- Update, discussion, and possible direction on a report from Volunteers of America (VOA) and the Community Assistance Center

Vice Chair Jardon said this agenda item was covered during the prior item.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

20-032C **AGENDA ITEM 11** Public Comment.

Mr. Bruce Parks asserted the mitigation tent camps in Olympia, Washington sanctioned by the city were failures; the individual in charge of the camps said he would bulldoze and start over if he could. He said any program funded by tax dollars which enabled people to continue in that lifestyle needed to be eliminated quickly. He noted cities in the north spent significant amounts of time and money managing the issue, but he hoped to eradicate the issue completely. He believed this community could become the beacon for the world by demonstrating homelessness was a solvable issue if addressed properly.

Ms. Iris Jehle-Peppard said she understood the concern about taxpayers paying for homelessness. She had many discussions with law enforcement and repeatedly heard that policing would not solve the issue. She noted police officers mentioned a person arrested for illegal camping could be released in less than 12 hours. She said policing was possible, but the issue would persist. She wanted to honor the progress being made on the homelessness issue.

Vice Chair Jardon thanked everyone for attending the meeting with an open mind, kindness, and a desire to collaborate.

* * * * *

10:51 a.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

BOB LUCEY, Chair
Community Homelessness Advisory Board

ATTEST:

NANCY PARENT, County Clerk

*Minutes Prepared by:
Carolina Stickley and LJ Burton, Deputy County Clerks*

Pending Board Approval